Towards Cooperation by Carrier Aggregation in Heterogeneous Networks: A Hierarchical Game Approach

Pu Yuan, Yong Xiao, *Senior Member, IEEE,* Guoan Bi, *Senior Member*, IEEE and Liren Zhang, *Senior Member*

arXiv:1511.04245v1 [cs.NI] 13 Nov 2015

***Abstract*—This paper studies the resource allocation problem for a heterogeneous network (HetNet) in which the spectrum owned by a macro-cell operator (MCO) can be shared by both unlicensed users (UUs) and licensed users (LUs). We formulate a novel hierarchical game theoretic framework to jointly optimize the transmit powers and sub-band allocations of the UUs as well as the pricing strategies of the MCO. In our framework, an overlapping coalition formation (OCF) game has been introduced to model the cooperative behaviors of the UUs. We then integrate this OCF game into a Stackelberg game-based hierarchical framework. We prove that the core of our proposed OCF game is non-empty and introduce an optimal sub-band allocation scheme for UUs. A simple distributed algorithm is proposed for UUs to autonomously form optimal coalition formation structure. The Stackelberg Equilibrium (SE) of the proposed hierarchical game is derived and its uniqueness and optimality have been proved. A distributed joint optimization algorithm is also proposed to approach the SE of the game with limited information exchanges between the MCO and the UU.**

I. Introduction

A HetNet is a multiple tier network consisting of co-located macro-cells, micro-cells and femto-cells. It has been included in Long Term Evolution Advanced (LTE-A) standard as a part of the next generation mobile network technology. One of the motivations driving the development of HetNets is its potential to improve the spectrum utilization efficiency by reusing the existing frequency bands. Due to the scarcity of radio resources, it is important to find an efficient method to improve the network capacity with the limited radio resources.

The femto-cell is introduced to improve coverage of the cellular network as well as quality of service (QoS) of indoor mobile subscribers. The femto-cell which is controlled by a lower power BS covers a small area and provides radio link to its own subscribers. As the deployment of the femto-cells is made by the consumers, centralized control is generally difficult to achieve. Game theory provides useful tools to study distributed optimization problems for multi-user network systems. Various game theoretical models have been proposed to distributedly optimize the spectrum sharing between femto-cells and existing cellular network infrastructure [1], [2]. In [1], the authors modeled the distributed interference control problem as a non-cooperative game and discussed the impact of different pricing schemes on the performance of the spectrum sharing network. By using Stackelberg game model, a pricing based approach to handle the interference control problem was proposed in [3], where a sub-band pricing scheme is introduced to regulate the received power at the BS for the code division multiple access (CDMA) communication system. However their assumption that all UUs can only access one communication channel may not always hold in practical scenarios.

In this paper, we consider a special HetNets in which the spectrum licensed to an MCO can be shared by mulitple co-located femto-cell base stations (BS). The femto-cell BSs try to make the best use of the spectrum offered by the MCO. The users subscribed to the service of the MCO are regarded as the LUs who have the priority to access the resources of the MCO. The users subscribed to the femto-cell service are UUs and can only share the sub-bands owned by the MCO under the condition that the resulting interference to the LUs should be maintained below a tolerable level. The sub-band allocation of each UU is controlled by its corresponding femto-cell BS. In the latest LTE-A system, the CA is introduced to support wide-band high-speed transmission by allowing multiple users to aggregate their radio resources together [4] [5] [6]. Hence, we assume that each femto-cell BS can allocate multiple contiguous or non-contiguous sub-bands for each of its UUs and enabling the carrier aggregation. We also assume each sub-band can be accessed by multiple users at the same time. We formulate the sub-band allocation problem as an overlapping coalition formation game (OCF-game). In this game, a coalition is formed by the UUs who access the same sub-band. Since each UU can access multiple sub-bands, two or more coalitions may contain the same UU. In other words, the coalitions formed by UUs can be overlapped. The performance of each UU not only depends on the sub-band allocation scheme but also its transmit power used to send signals in different coalitions.

We integrate the OCF-game into a hierarchical game framework to investigate the interaction between the MCO and the UU. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work which integrates the OCF-game model into an hierarchical game framework to the analyze of HetNets.

It is knowing that allowing overlapping among multiple coalitions will significantly increase the complexity of the game problem. Specifically, finding a stable coalition formation structure of an overlapping coalition formation game is

P. Yuan and G. Bi are with School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore (e-mails: pyuan2@ntu.edu.sg and EGBI@ntu.edu.sg).

Y. Xiao is with the Electrical and Computer Engineering at the University of Houston, TX, USA (e-mails: xyong.2012@gmail.com).

L. Zhang is with the College of Information Technology, UAE University (Email: lzhang@uaeu.ac.ae).



Fig. 1. A spectrum sharing multi-tier HetNet in which the spectrum is owned by the macro-cell and shared with other tiers.

notoriously difficult and generally requires to exhaustively search all the possible structures. In this paper, we however show that it is possible to find the core of our proposed game under this spectrum-sharing-based HetNet without exhaustive searching. The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

1) A spectrum-sharing based HetNet is considered in which the femto-cell BS can aggregate multiple sub-bands of the MCO and allocate aggregated sub-bands to support high-speed wide-band data transmission for each UU. This is different from our previous work [7] [8] where each UU is assumed to only access one sub-band.
2) The OCF-game model is applied to study the scenario that the cooperative UUs can dedicate their power resources to multiple sub-bands.
3) The non-emptiness of the core of our proposed OCF-game is proved, which makes the optimization of the coalition formation structure possible.
4) A hierarchical game framework is established to study the joint optimization of transmit power and sub-band allocation of UUs as well as the pricing strategy of the MCO.
5) Numerical results are presented to analyze the impact of power constraint, number of users, number of available sub-bands on the performance of HetNets.

The remaining of the paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the related works. Section III introduces the system setup. Section IV presents the problem formulation. Section V gives the game theoretic analysis and Section VI presents the distributed algorithm and Section VII shows the numerical results. Section VIII concludes the paper.

II. Related Works

An important problem in a spectrum-sharing based network is how to give sufficient protection to the LUs of the MCO. The interference power constraint [9] is usually applied to regulate the spectrum sharing between UUs and LUs. In this case the Stackelberg game can be a useful tool to model the interaction between the MCO and the UUs. In [1] and [3], the MCO acts as the leader and has the priority to set a price to access the radio resource, and the UUs act as followers and will decide their best transmit powers based on the prices. These works show the usefulness of using Stackelberg game model in solving interference control problem with hierarchical structure, which motivated us to include the Stackelberg game into our hierarchical game framework. However the assumption that all UUs can only access one communication channel with flat-fading may not always hold in practical scenarios. In our previous work [7], we focus on the case that the spectrum owned by the MCO is divided into sub-bands, while these sub-bands can be shared with the UUs. A non-cooperative game model to enable the UU to sequentially join the sub-bands while the interference to the MCO is controlled by a pricing mechanism. The limitation of this solution is that the sub-band and UUs can only be one-to-one paired so frequency reuse among UUs is not considered.

The carrier aggregation (CA) is proposed to support high peak data rate in LTE-A standard [10]. The CA technique [5] [6] is the process of aggregating different blocks of under-utilized spectrum into larger transmission bandwidths to support high data rate. The technical challenges in the implementing CA have been discussed in [4]. Motivated from the concept of CA, we consider the scenario that the UUs can share the sub-bands with selected UUs. In [11], a similar system setup has been considered, and a heuristic algorithm is reported to achieve the Nash equilibrium of the proposed game. This work, however, only considers non-cooperative competition between UUs. In this paper, we propose a general hierarchical game theoretic framework that allows cooperation among UUs in a distributed fashion.

The game theory based resource allocation has also been used to study the coordination of the BSs on sub-carrier selection and interference management [12], [13]. In [12], the authors proposed a BS cooperation policy for nearby BSs to pick up suitable component carriers to perform CA, therefore the inter-cell interference is mitigated. In [13], the authors analyzed the coexistence problem of macro-cell BS (primary user) and femto-cell BS (secondary user) from a cognitive radio point of view. A series of techniques, such as adaptive power transmission, non-cooperative and coalitional game, is introduced to give the solution to the interference management. However, in this paper we consider the coordination between the UUs rather than the BSs, which is a challenging task as the mobility and more population of the UUs than the BSs.

In [14] the authors studied the cooperation problem between cellular subscribers located at the middle and boundary of each cell. They found that carefully constructing pair-wise coalitions between middle and boundary nodes by allowing the middle nodes to relay the packets of boundary nodes can significantly improve the overall performance of the network. In [15], the rate allocation problem for Gaussian multiple access channels was investigated. The authors proved that it was possible to find an unique allocation, which always lies in the core of the game. In [8] the authors studied the cooperative behavior of secondary users in a two-tier spectrum sharing cognitive network where both the Stackelberg game and non-

overlapping coalition formation game were combined to build a hierarchical game framework. A joint solution was given to the sub-band allocation and interference control problem. Although the coaltional game has been widely used to study the problems in wireless communications, most of the existing works only allow users to form disjoint coalitions. In practical communication systems, allowing overlapping of coalitions can further improve the performance [16]. For example, one mobile subscriber may cooperatively transmit in two different sub-bands with two different subscribers. However, so far only limited works have been reported to apply the overlapping coalitional game to analyze cellular networking systems. In [17], the authors studied how small cell BSs coordinate with each other to achieve efficient transmission. By allowing the femto-cells to form overlapping coalitions to jointly schedule the transmission of their subscribers, they found that the performance of mobile nodes near the cell edge was improved. The key difference of the proposed work comparing to the ones mentioned above is that, we adopt a new OCF-game model which enables each player to join multiple coalitions.

III. System Setup

Consider an orthogonal frequency-division multiple access (OFDMA) based two-tier network where the spectrum owned by an MCO is divided into M sub-bands each of which can be accessed by multiple UUs controlled by the femto-cell BSs as illustrated in Fig. 1. We denote the set of sub-bands as $\mathcal{B}$ and the set of femto-cell BSs as $\mathcal{K}$. Here the concept of *underlay* borrowed from the cognitive radio which means that each secondary user (i.e., UU) is allowed to access the spectrum of primary users (i.e., LUs) which can tolerate limited interference from the UUs [18]. In this paper, we consider frequency selective fading, i.e., channel fading in different sub-bands is interdependent. We assume the channel state is time-invariant and can be regarded as an constant within the duration of each time slot. We further assume that the mobile devices are equipped with multiple antennas and hence can transmit over multiple sub-bands at the same time. Furthermore, multiple UUs are allowed to share the same sub-band with each LU. We perform the system analysis using numerical calculations and the simulation is running on Matlab platform.

Each femto-cell BS can apply multiple sub-bands to support services for UUs, i.e., each sub-band can be accessed by the UUs from more than one femto-cell BS. We assume that in each time slot there is only one active UU S_k connected with femto-cell BS k. Let h_k^m be the channel gain between S_k and the macro-cell BS receiver in sub-band m, and g_{kj}^m be the channel gain between S_k and jth femto-cell BS. Let $\boldsymbol{p}_{S_k} = [p_{S_k}^1, ..., p_{S_k}^M]$ be the power allocation vector of UUs, where $p_{S_k}^m = 0$ implies that sub-band m is not used by S_k. Table I lists the notations and symbols used in this paper . Multiple femto-cell BSs can apply for the same sub-band at the same time. We denote the set of all UUs as $\mathcal{S}$. We denote the set of UUs utilizing the same sub-band m as $\mathcal{L}_m$, i.e., $\mathcal{L}_m = \{S_k : p_{S_k}^m > 0, \forall S_k \in \mathcal{S}$. $\mathcal{L}_m = \emptyset$ means no UU uses sub-band m, $\mathcal{L}_m = \{S_k\}$ means sub-band m is exclusively occupied by femto-cell BS k, and $|\mathcal{L}_m| \geq 2$ means sub-band m has been shared by two or more femto-cell BSs.

Different from the previous works which consider the distributed spectrum-sharing scheme [11], UUs can cooperatively transmit the signal with co-channel peers to further improve their pay-offs. In this paper, we follow the same line as [19] and assume that UUs from different femto-cells sharing the same sub-band m can cooperate by forming a virtual $|\mathcal{L}_m|$-input $|\mathcal{L}_m|$-output MIMO channel [19].

In this paper, we consider the following two power constraints:

- Interference power constraint in each sub-band m,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{S_k}^m h_{S_k}^m \leq \overline{Q}, \tag{1}$$

  where the maximum tolerable interference $\overline{Q}$ is determined by the macro-cell BS to protect the LUs.
- The transmit power cap of the mobile devices,

$$\sum_{m=1}^{M} p_{S_k}^m \leq \overline{p}, \tag{2}$$

  where $p_{S_k}^m$ is the transmit power of S_k on sub-band m and $\overline{p}$ is the the total amount of power that can be used by each UU S_k to transmit signals. The value of $\bar{p}$ depends on the physical limits of the hardware as well as the battery life.

Remark: These two power constraints together limit the number of UUs accessing each sub-band. For example, if $\overline{p}$ and $h_{S_k}^m$ are large, UU S_k may cause interference that is close to $\overline{Q}$ so that it will be the only active UU in sub-band m. If $\overline{p}$ and $h_{S_k}^m$ are small, multiple UUs can simultaneously access the same sub-band, and the accumulated interference is still below $\overline{Q}$. The number of sub-bands used by an individual UU is affected by the power cap given in (2), but the total number of the active UUs in each sub-band is limited by the maximum tolerable interference level constraint in (1).

The interference power constraint reflects the fact that the randomly distributed UUs usually give different levels of interference to each macro-cell BS. Due to the frequency selective fading, the interferences from the same UU are generally different in different sub-bands. Hence the UUs are preferred to transmit in those frequency bands with weak channel gains between the UUs and the macro-cell BS.

TABLE I
The Notations

$\pi_{S_k}(\boldsymbol{p}_{S_k}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$	pay-off function of UU S_k
$\boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{p}^m, \mu^m)$	value function of partial coalition m
$\boldsymbol{l}_{S_k}$	sub-band allocation vector of UU S_k
$\boldsymbol{\mu}$	interference price vector
$h_{S_k}^m$	channel gain from UU S_k to macro-cell BS in sub-band m
$p_{S_k}^m$	transmit power of UU S_k in sub-band m
$g_{i,j}^m$	the ratio of the channel gain between UU i and BS j to the interference power at k in sub-band m
$\lambda_{S_k}^m$	the pay-off division factor for UU S_k in sub-band m
$\boldsymbol{P}$	the power allocation matrix of all UUs

An important problem is how UUs can distributedly form different coalitions to improve their pay-offs. We formulate an overlapping coalition formation game to study this problem. In this game, UUs can behave cooperatively to coordinate their actions. Hence the coalition formation game focuses on solving the following two questions: Q1) how the coalition members coordinate with each other, and Q2) how a coalition formation structure can be established among UUs.

To answer the first question, the virtual MIMO technique is used as the cooperation scheme among the UUs in the same coalition for two reasons: 1) it is shown to achieve the upper-bound of the rate for a multiple access channel [20], 2) it is shown to satisfy the proportional fairness [8]. More specifically, the UUs in the same sub-band m form a coalition and cooperate with each other to transmit and receive signal. Using the virtual MIMO technique, we can convert the communication within one coalition into a virtual $\mathcal{L}_m$-input $\mathcal{L}_m$-output channel, which follows the same line as [20] and [8]. Therefore the capacity sum of all UUs in the mth virtual MIMO channel is obtained as,

$$\sum_{S_k \in \mathcal{L}_m} r_{S_k} = \sum_{S_k \in \mathcal{L}_m} \log\left(1 + \lambda_{S_k}^m p_{S_k}^m\right), \tag{3}$$

where $\lambda_{S_k}^m$ is the kth non-zero eigenvalue of matrix $\boldsymbol{G}_{\{S_k \in \mathcal{L}_m\}}^T \boldsymbol{G}_{\{S_k \in \mathcal{L}_m\}}$ where $\boldsymbol{G}_{\{S_k \in \mathcal{L}_m\}}$ is the channel gain matrix of UUs in the same sub-band. For example, if $\{S_1, ..., S_n\}$ are in the same sub-band m, then the matrix is given by

$$\boldsymbol{G}_{\{S_k \in \mathcal{L}_m\}} = \begin{bmatrix} g_{11}^m & g_{12}^m & \cdots & g_{1n}^m \\ g_{21}^m & g_{22}^m & \cdots & g_{2n}^m \\ . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . \\ g_{n1}^m & g_{n2}^m & \cdots & g_{nn}^m \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

In the above matrix, $g_{jk}^m = \frac{g_{jk}^{m'}}{\sigma_k^m}$, where $g_{jk}^{m'}$ is the channel gain between UU S_j and femto-cell BS k, and σ_k^m is the received interference power at BS k in sub-band m. We will give detailed analysis and propose a distributive algorithm to answer the second question in section V.

To simplify the analysis, let us consider the uplink transmission. In the uplink, the receiver of macro-cell BS is interfered by the transmit signals of UUs. Therefore there is only one leader when it applies price-based interference control. However, our model can be directly extended to the downlink scenario. In the downlink case, multiple LUs act as a group of leaders which can cooperatively decide the interference price in each sub-band. The main objectives of this paper are to solve the following problems:

1) *Power control problem*: investigating how the MCO controls the interference power to protect the LUs by dynamically adjusting the interference price.
2) *Sub-band allocation problem*: investigating how the UUs choose the sub-bands to access based on the channel information, the interference price and the action of other UUs.
3) *Overlapping Coalition formation problem*: investigating how the UUs form overlapping coalitions to improve their data rate.

We formulate a hierarchical game framework to jointly optimize the above three problems.

IV. The Hierarchical Game Formulation

The interaction between the macro-cell BS and femto-cell BS can be modeled as a Stackelberg game. Furthermore, we also formulate a OCF-game to investigate the cooperation among the femto-cell BSs, where their UUs can form coalitions to improve the performance. We assume that the transmission of femto-cell and macro-cell are synchronized.

Our goal is to jointly solve the power control problem of the LUs and resource allocation problem of the UUs. Firstly, there is a trade-off between the capacity sum of the femto-cell network and QoS of the macro-cell. If the UUs transmit with high power, they will get high data rate but generate more interference to the macro-cell BS. Since sufficient protection to the LUs should be guaranteed in the first place, the MCO should regulate the behavior of the UUs. We can model this as a power control problem for UUs. Secondly, given the limited spectrum and power resources, we should consider how the UUs can cooperate with each other to allocate the sub-band and optimize their transmit power.

We model a hierarchical game consisting of the two sub games. In the proposed game model, the MCO and femto-cell BSs are the *players*. The way the players play the game is defined as *actions*. In the proposed game model, the action of the MCO is to decide the interference prices, and the actions of the UUs are to decide which sub-bands to access and how much power should be allocated to each of these sub-bands.

We apply the Stackelberg game to model the interaction between the MCO and the femto-cell BSs. In the proposed Stackelberg game, the *leader* is the MCO and the corresponding LUs and the *followers* are the femto-cell BSs who control the UUs. Let us follow a commonly adopted game theoretic setup [1] [21] [22] to define the pay-off of S_k as,

$$\pi_{S_k}(\boldsymbol{p}_{S_k}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = r_{S_k}(\boldsymbol{p}_{S_k}) - c_{S_k}(\boldsymbol{p}_{S_k}, \boldsymbol{\mu}), \tag{5}$$

where $c_{S_k}(p_{S_k,\mu}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \mu^m h_{S_k}^m p_{S_k}^m$ is the cost function. Furthermore, since S_k can simultaneously access multiple sub-bands, it aims to maximize the sum of the pay-offs obtained from all the active sub-bands under the constraints given in (1) and (2).

The MCO collects the payment from all the UUs occupying the sub-bands. We define the pay-off functions of the MCO as,

$$\pi_{MCO}(\boldsymbol{p}_{S_k}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \sum_{k=1}^{S_k} c_{S_k}(\boldsymbol{p}_{S_k}, \boldsymbol{\mu}). \tag{6}$$

The main solution for our proposed hierarchical game is the Stackelberg equilibrium (SE) which is formally defined as follows: [23],

Definition 1. *For a fixed sub-band allocation, the pricing vector* $\boldsymbol{\mu}^* = [\mu_1^*, ..., \mu_M^*]$ *and the transmit power* $\boldsymbol{p}_{S_k}^* = [p_{S_k}^{1*}, ..., p_{S_k}^{M*}], k = 1, ..., K$, *form a SE if the interference*



Fig. 2. The hierarchical game structure.

power constraint in (1) is satisfied, and for any $m \in \{1, ..., M\}$ *and* $k \in \{1, ..., K\}$*, we have*

$$\mu_m^* = \arg\max_{\mu_m \geq 0} \pi_{MCO}(\boldsymbol{p}^*, \mu_m, \mu_{-m}^*) \tag{7}$$

where μ_{-m} *means all the MCO except for* m*. For any given price* $\boldsymbol{\mu}$*,* $\boldsymbol{p}^*$ *is given by*

$$\boldsymbol{p}_{S_k}^* = \arg\max_{p_{S_k} \geq 0} \pi_{S_k}(p_{S_k}, \boldsymbol{p}_{-S_k}^*). \tag{8}$$

The structure of the hierarchical game is illustrated in Fig. 2. The MCOs can adjust their prices to maximize the pay-off defined in (6). We will show that the optimal price is specified by the dynamics of the interference from the CA in each sub-band. The femto-cells BSs can cooperate and self-organize into coalitions each of which consists of member UUs to coordinate the transmission to improve the sum of the pay-offs. On the femto-cells BS side, they cooperate and self-organize into coalitions, in which their member UUs can coordinate their transmission to improve the sum of pay-off.

A. The pay-off of UU

Suppose that the overlapping coalition formation structure is fixed. Each S_k having already obtained a fixed λ_{S_k}, we can write the payoff of each UU S_k as

$$\pi_{S_k}^m(p_{S_k}^m, \mu^m, \lambda_{S_k}^m) = \log\left(1 + \lambda_{S_k}^m p_{S_k}\right) - \mu^m h_{S_k}^m p_{S_k}^m. \tag{9}$$

The optimal power allocation of S_k is obtained by solving the following optimization problem,

Problem 1.

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{p}_{S_k}} \pi_{S_k}(\boldsymbol{p}_{S_k}, \boldsymbol{p}_{-S_k}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{S_k})$$
$$\text{S.t.} \quad \sum_{m=1}^{M} p_{S_k}^m \leq \overline{p}.$$

In the proposed Stackelberg game framework, the maximum tolerable interference in (1) is omitted in Problem 1 because it is included in the interference μ^m and thus is autonomously satisfied. Hence we only need to consider the constraint in (2).

Problem 1 can be directly solved by using the standard convex optimization approaches and the resulting optimal transmit power for UU S_k in sub-band m is given by,

$$p_{S_k}^{m\dagger} = \arg\max_{p_{S_k}^m \geq 0} \pi_{S_k}^m(p_{S_k}^m, , \mu^m, \lambda_{S_k}^m) \tag{10}$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{\mu^m h_{S_k}^m} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{S_k}^m}\right)^+. \tag{11}$$

We write $\boldsymbol{p}_{S_k}^\dagger = [p_{S_k}^{1\dagger}, p_{S_k}^{2\dagger}, ..., p_{S_k}^{m\dagger}]$. Due to the power cap constraint in (2), the final power allocation will fall into the following two cases:

Case 1. $\sum_{m=1}^{M} p_{S_k}^{m\dagger} \leq \overline{p}$*. In this case,* S_k *can access all sub-bands under the constraint defined in (2). The power allocation of* S_k *is decided by constraint in (1). Hence we can remove (2) and the power allocation of the UU solely depends on the sub-band prices. Each of the UUs tries to solve (9) for the optimal power allocation and obtain* $p_{S_k}^{m\dagger}$ *to maximize the pay-off.*

Case 2. $\sum_{m=1}^{M} p_{S_k}^{m\dagger} > \bar{p}$*. In this case, only selected sub-bands can be accessed by the UU* S_k*. More specifically, the solution is achieved by searching a sub-set* $\mathcal{N}_i \subset \mathcal{M}$ *such that the following condition is satisfied:*

$$\sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_i} \pi(p_{S_k}^{m\dagger}) \geq \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_j, j \neq i} \pi(p_{S_k}^{n\dagger}), \tag{12}$$

where $\{\mathcal{N}_j\}$ *denotes the set of all possible sub-sets of* $\mathcal{M}$ *except* $\mathcal{N}_i$*. This case implies that once the price is fixed, the number of sub-bands accessed by one UU is bounded by the power cap constraint, and obviously we have* $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_i} p_{S_k}^{m\dagger} \leq \overline{p}$*.*

In either cases, we can obtain the optimal power allocation of S_k:

$$\boldsymbol{p}_{S_k}^* = \{p_{S_k}^{m*}, m = 1, 2, ..., M.\},$$
$$p_{S_k}^{m*} = \begin{cases} p^{m\dagger}, \text{if } m \in \mathcal{N}_i \\ 0, \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

The corresponding sub-band allocation indicator is,

$$\boldsymbol{l}_{S_k}^* = \{l_{S_k}^{m*}, m = 1, 2, ..., M.\},$$
$$l_{S_k}^{m*} = \begin{cases} 1, \text{if } \boldsymbol{l}_{S_k}^* > 0, \\ 0, \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

From the results above, it can be observed that the optimal solution of the transmit power only depends on the values of μ^m and $\lambda_{S_k}^m$. The prices are decided by the MCO through its interaction with UUs, and $\lambda_{S_k}^m$ is obtained from coalition formation structures of UUs. In rest of this section, we discuss how to obtain optimal μ^m and $\lambda_{S_k}^m$.

B. The pay-off of the MCO

The MCO can use the prices $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ charged to the UUs to control the interference in each sub-band. We will show that the MCO can maximize its pay-off by adjusting the prices based on the dynamic of the aggregated interference at the macro-cell BS receiver. Hence the proposed algorithm greatly reduces the communication overhead and makes the distributed power allocation approach possible.

The revenue gained by the MCO by sharing sub-band m is given by:

$$\pi_{MCO}(\boldsymbol{p}^m, \mu^m) = \mu^m \sum_{k=1}^{K} h_{S_k}^m p_{S_k}^m. \tag{15}$$

Hence the MCO tries to find the optimal sub-band price to maximize its revenue in each sub-band under the maximum tolerable interference constraint.

Problem 2.

$$\max_{\mu^m} \ \pi_{MCO}(\boldsymbol{p}^m, \mu^m) \tag{16}$$

$$s.t. \ \sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{S_k}^m h_{S_k}^m \leq \overline{Q}. \tag{17}$$

$$p_{S_k}^m \geq 0. \tag{18}$$

Substitute (11) into Problem 2, we obtain,

Problem 3.

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \ \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left(\frac{1}{h_{S_k}^m} - \frac{\mu^m}{\lambda_{S_k}^m} \right)^+ h_{S_k}^m \tag{19}$$

$$s.t. \ \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left(\frac{1}{\mu^m h_{S_k}^m} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{S_k}^m} \right)^+ h_{S_k}^m \leq \overline{Q}, \tag{20}$$

Using standard convex optimization approach to find the optimal μ^m in above problem requires the MCO to obtain global information of the UUs. Fortunately, Problem 3 has a nice property that the objective and constraint functions both monotonically decrease with μ^m. Hence if we assume the power cap constraint is satisfied, then the objective function will be maximized when the constraint in (20) takes equality. Note that the left side of (20) is the aggregated interference received by macro-cell BS in sub-band m. Therefore the MCO can optimize price μ^m and affect the aggregated interferences to the upper bound.

V. Coalition Formation Game Analysis

In this section, we first define the coalitional game and imputation, and then analyze the game properties to prove the existence of the core.

Definition 2 ([24], Chapter 9)**.** *A coalition $\mathcal{C}$ is a non-empty sub-set of the set of all players $\mathcal{K}$, i.e., $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$. A coalition of all players is referred as the grand coalition $\mathcal{K}$. A coalitional game is defined as $(\mathcal{C}, v)$ where v is the value function mapping a coalition structure $\mathcal{C}$ to a real value $v(\mathcal{C})$. A coalitional game is said to be super-additive if for any two disjoint coalitions $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$, $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2 = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \subset \mathcal{K}$, we have,*

$$v(\mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2) \geq v(\mathcal{C}_1) + v(\mathcal{C}_2). \tag{21}$$

Given two coalitions $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$, we say $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ overlap if $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2 \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 3. *A pay-off vector $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is a division of the value $v(\mathcal{C})$ to all the coalition members, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\pi} = [\pi_{S_1}, \cdots, \pi_{S_K}]$. We say $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is group rational if $\sum_{k=1}^{K} \pi_{S_k} = v(\mathcal{C})$ and individual rational if $\pi_{S_k} \geq v(\{S_k\}), \forall S_k \in \mathcal{C}$. We define an imputation as a pay-off vector satisfying both group and individual rationalities.*

If a coalitional game satisfies the supper-additive condition, all the players will have the incentive to form a grand coalition. However if the supper-additive condition does not hold, then the grand coalition will not be the optimal solution for all players. In this case, the players will try to form a stable coalition formation structure in which no player can profitably deviate from it. In the proposed OCF-game, for each possible prices of the MCO, we focus on finding optimal coalition formation structure, for UUs to share the spectrum of the MCO.

When overlapping is enabled among coalitions, the coalitions are no longer disjoint sub sets of the player set as defined in the non-overlapping coalitional game. In the OCF-game, the concept *partial coalition* is utilized:

Definition 4. *The partial coalition is defined as a vector $\boldsymbol{p}^m = (p_{S_1}^m, p_{S_2}^m, ..., p_{S_K}^m)$, where $p_{S_k}^m$ is the fractional resource of S_k dedicated to coalition m. Note that $p_{S_k}^m = 0$ means S_k is not a member of the mth coalition. A coalition structure is a collection $\boldsymbol{P} = (\boldsymbol{p}^1, ..., \boldsymbol{p}^M)$ of partial coalitions.*

Remark 1. *In a non-overlapping coalition formation game, a coalition is just a subset of the player set. For a player set of size N, the number of coalition formation structures is given by the Bell number B_N, where $B_N = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \binom{N-1}{k} B_k$ is the number of possible coalition structures and B_k is the number of ways to partition the set into k items.*

For example, for a game with two players S_1 and S_2, the possible partitions can be written as $\{S_1, S_2\}$ or $\{\{S_1\}, \{S_2\}\}$. However, in OCF-game the concept of partial coalition not only specifies who joins each coalition, but also indicates how much resource each player will allocate to each coalition. If the resource is continuous, there are generally an infinite number of partial coalitions. It means that the concept of coalition can be regarded as a special case of the partial coalition, where each player joins only one coalition with all its resource.

Definition 5. *An OCF-game is denoted by $G = (\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{M}, \boldsymbol{P}, \boldsymbol{v})$, where*

- *$\mathcal{K} = \{1, 2, ..., K\}$ is the set of players which are the femto-cell BSs.*
- *$\mathcal{M} = \{1, 2, ..., M\}$ is the set of sub-bands.*
- *$\boldsymbol{P}$ is the power allocation matrix, where the row $\boldsymbol{p}_{S_k} = (p_{S_k}^1, p_{S_k}^2, ..., p_{S_k}^M)$ represents how player S_k assign its power on different sub-bands, and the column $\boldsymbol{p}^m = (p_{S_1}^m, p_{S_2}^m, ..., p_{S_K}^m)$ represents the power each player consumes for sub-band m. $\boldsymbol{p}^m = (p_{S_1}^m, p_{S_2}^m, ..., p_{S_K}^m)$ also corresponds to a partial coalition.*
- *$\boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{C}^m) : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is the value function, which represents the total pay-off of a partial coalition $\boldsymbol{C}^m$.*

Definition 6. *We define a game to be U-finite if for any coalition structure that arises in this game, the number of all possible partial coalitions is bounded by U.*

Fig. 3 illustrates an example of the overlapping coalition formation of our model. The spectrum of the MCO is divided into six sub-bands $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ which can be allocated to three mobile devices $\{M1, M2, M3\}$. A coalition is formed



Fig. 3. The illustration of the overlapping coalitions in our proposed game.

on the sub-band if it is accessed by two or more mobile devices. Each mobile device may belong to multiple coalitions, since it may access multiple sub-bands at the same time. We say the coalitions containing a common member player are overlapping. For example, in Fig. 3, we denote the coalition formed by the devices accessing sub-band k as $\mathcal{C}_k$, Then we have, $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{M1\}$, $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{M1, M3\}$, $\mathcal{C}_3 = \{M3\}$, $\mathcal{C}_4 = \{M1, M2, M3\}$, $\mathcal{C}_6 = \{M2, M3\}$, $\mathcal{C}_5 = \emptyset$. Hence, $\mathcal{C}_1$, $\mathcal{C}_2$ and $\mathcal{C}_4$ overlap with each other since $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2 \cap \mathcal{C}_4 = M1$. Similarly, $\mathcal{C}_3 \cap \mathcal{C}_4 \cap \mathcal{C}_6 = M2$ and $\mathcal{C}_2 \cap \mathcal{C}_4 \cap \mathcal{C}_6 = M3$.

The sum rate achieved by forming coalition is given by (3), and the pay-off sum of UUs equals to the sum rate minus the payment to the MCO. Hence the value function of the partial coalition $\boldsymbol{p}^m$ is defined as the pay-off sum on sub-band m. Given the fixed price vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, the value function of the partial coalition $\boldsymbol{p}^m$ is given by,

$$\boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{p}^m, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^m) = \sum_{S_k \in \mathcal{L}_m} r_{S_k} - \sum_{S_k \in \mathcal{L}_m} \mu^m h_{S_k}^m p_{S_k}^m. \tag{22}$$

It is proved in [8] that the pay-off division among coalition members satisfies the proportional fairness [25] and if the benefit allocated to each member equals to its contribution to the overall rate in sub-band m, i.e.,

$$r_{S_k}^m = \log\left(1 + \lambda_{S_k}^m p_{S_k}^m\right). \tag{23}$$

The solution of the optimal power vector $p_{S_k}^m$ of S_k is given by (13), which is a function of $\lambda_{S_k}^m$ and μ^m. Since $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is imposed by the MCO, the UUs can optimize their pay-off sum by choosing proper sub-bands to access. Furthermore, since $\lambda_{S_k}^m$ is decided by the coalition structure, finding sub-band allocation will directly affect the payoff of each UU.

There are two types of actions of the players in an OCF-game, which are the coalitional action and the overlapping action. The former defines how the resource being allocated among the member players in one coalition, and the latter defines how resources being allocated between players in the overlapping parts of multiple coalitions. These are the key features to differentiate the OCF-game from the non-overlapping coalition formation game.

In the proposed system setup, the femto-cell BSs whose UUs are accessing the same sub-band form a coalition. The cooperation among the member players is achieved by forming a virtual MIMO channel. The pay-off division relies on assigning $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ to the players, which can be considered as the contribution of each coalition member to the sum rate. Since the UUs can join multiple coalitions, the proposed game becomes an OCF-game. The resource of a UU is the total transmit power. The UUs need to allocate its transmit power in each sub-band properly for maximizing the pay-off. For the proposed OCF-game, we have the following definition.

Definition 7. *For a set of UUs $\mathcal{S}$, a coalition structure on $\mathcal{S}$ is a finite list of vectors (partial coalitions) $\boldsymbol{P} = (\boldsymbol{p}^1, ..., \boldsymbol{p}^M)$ that satisfies (i) $\sum_{k=1}^K h_{S_k}^m p_{S_k}^m \leq \overline{Q}$, (ii) $\sup \boldsymbol{p}^m \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ for all $m = 1, ..., M$, and (iii) $\sum_{m=1}^M p_{S_k}^m \leq \overline{p}$ for all $j \in \mathcal{S}$.*

The power allocation matrix also indicates the utilization status of sub-bands. The constraint (i) states that the transmit power of UU in each sub-band is bounded, (ii) states that the overlapping coalition is a subset of the grand coalition, and (iii) states that the sum of transmit power is upper bounded.

Proposition 1. *The proposed OCF-game is 2^K-finite.*

Proof 1. *See Appendix A.* □

The above result suggests that it is possible to reduce the number of possible coalition formation structures into a finite set.

We are interested in investigating a stable coalition structure which optimizes the pay-off sum. Following the same line in [26], let us define the core of the OCF-game for the sub-bands allocation,

Definition 8. *For a set of players $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, a tuple $(\boldsymbol{P}_\mathcal{I}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_\mathcal{I})$ is in the core of an OCF-game $G = (\mathcal{K}, \boldsymbol{v})$. If for any other set of player $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, any coalition structure $\boldsymbol{P}_\mathcal{J}$ on $\mathcal{J}$, and any imputation $\boldsymbol{y}_\mathcal{J}$, we have $p_j(\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{J}, \boldsymbol{y}_\mathcal{J}) \leq p_i(\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{I}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_\mathcal{I})$ for some player $j \in J$.*

Theorem 1. *[26] Given an OCF-game $G = (\mathcal{K}, \boldsymbol{v})$, if $\boldsymbol{v}$ is continuously bounded, monotone and U-finite for some $U \in \mathbb{N}$, then an outcome $(\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ is in the core of G iff $\forall S \in N$,*

$$\sum_{j \in S} p_j(\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) \leq v^*(S), \tag{24}$$

where $v^*(S)$ is the least upper bound on the value that the members of S can achieve by forming the coalition.

Proposition 2. *The core of the proposed OCF-game is non-empty.*

Proof 2. *: See Appendix B.* □

Since enabling overlapping in the coalition formation game will significantly increase the complexity of the game, the overlapping coalition structure is sometimes unstable as there may exist cycles in the game play. For example, let us consider a network system with three UUs S_1, S_2 and S_3, and two sub-bands l_1 and l_2. We denote $\pi_{S_j}[m|S_i]$ as the pay-off obtained by S_j when it forms coalition with S_i on sub-band m, and $\pi_{S_j}[m|\emptyset]$ is the pay-off obtained by S_j when it

exclusively occupies m. Initially, since $\pi_{S_1}[l_1|\emptyset] > \pi_{S_1}[l_2|\emptyset]$, $\pi_{S_2}[l_2|\emptyset] > \pi_{S_2}[l_1|\emptyset]$ and $\pi_{S_3}[l_2|\emptyset] > \pi_{S_3}[l_1|\emptyset]$, S_1 joins l_1, S_2 and S_3 join l_2. However, if we assume the following statements hold for the three UUs, 1) $\pi_{S_1}[l_2|S_2] > \pi_{S_1}[l_1|S_3]$ and $\pi_{S_1}[l_1|S_2] > \pi_{S_1}[l_2|S_3]$, 2) $\pi_{S_2}[l_1|S_3] > \pi_{S_2}[l_2|S_2]$ and $\pi_{S_2}[l_2|S_3] > \pi_{S_2}[l_1|S_2]$, 3)$\pi_{S_3}[l_1|S_1] > \pi_{S_3}[l_2|S_2]$, $\pi_{S_3}[l_2|S_1] > \pi_{S_3}[l_1|S_2]$, then we can easily observe that the game play of the coalition formation will be stuck in a cycle. To avoid this situation, a history of the coalition structure is maintained in the proposed algorithm. If a rotation is detected, it will be removed from the coalition formation flow.

VI. Coordination Protocol Design and Distributed Algorithm

In this section, we discuss the protocol design of the UUs' coordination and distributed algorithms which can reach the coalition structure in the core of the coalition formation game and the SE of the hierarchical game.

A. The Protocol Design for Coordination of UUs

To implement the proposed algorithm into more practical systems, we consider the MAC protocol in this section.. We have the following assumptions:

- We follow the same line as in [27] to introduce the following distributed coordination scheme among UUs. More specifically, the UUs accessing the same sub-bands perform in-band communication with each other, both control packets and data packets are transmit in the same channel, hence there is no need for a dedicated control channel.
- We follow the same line as in [8] and [28] and assume that the channel gain between each UU and femtocell BS is the same in both forward and backward directions.
- We assume that the channel gain can be regarded as a constant within one time slot. Each time slot consists of the duration for control packets exchange and data packets transmission.

We introduce two control packets, request-to-send (RTS) and clear-to-send (CTS), for UUs sharing the same sub-band to exchange their identity and establish coordination links with each other. Each control packet also contains the address information of the transmitter so the UU can identify the source of the packet. Each UU can extract the channel gain information from its received control packet.

Step 1) The channel gain estimation and neighborhood discovering:
   a) Firstly, the femto-cell BSs broadcast the RTS packet to all the UUs for them to estimate the channel gain.
   b) Each UU can then utilize the control packets for the in-band neighbor discovering and channel gain information exchange. For example, UU S_j sends $g_{jk}^{m\prime}$ and $g_{jj}^{m\prime}$ to UU S_k in sub-band m. Upon receiving the information sent by S_j, S_k will then send back a CTS packet containing $g_{kj}^{m\prime}$ and $g_{kk}^{m\prime}$ to S_j. Hence S_j knows that S_k is also accessing sub-band m as well as the channel gain information.

Step 2) Coalition formation:
   a) After the channel estimation and neighbor discovering, the UUs need to calculate and negotiate the pay-off division factor λ_k^m. Since the channel gain and neighborhood information is obtained in previous step, each of the UUs can construct $G_{S_k \in \mathcal{L}m}$ and subsequently calculate λ_k^m. The assignment of λ_k^m to each UU S_k could be random or follow some policies [8]. Here we assign the λ_k^m following the rank of channel gains. Suppose the pay-off division vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^m$ is sorted in ascending order $[\lambda_1^m, ..., \lambda_K^m]$. The UU S_k has already obtained the channel gain $g_{jj}^{m\prime}, j = 1, ..., K$ in step 1). S_k sorts the channel gain in ascending order and finds the rank value r_{S_k} of $g_{kk}^{m\prime}$. Then it picks the r_{S_k}th element in $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^m$ as its pay-off factor, i.e., $\lambda_k^m = \boldsymbol{\lambda}^m[r_{S_k}]$.
   b) Based on the pay-off division factor λ_k^m and price μ^m broadcast by the MCO, the UUs estimate their pay-offs and decide to accept or reject the current coalition structure. If all the UUs are satisfied, go to Step 3). If at least one UU is not satisfied, it will proposed a new sub-band allocation which makes the current coalition structure invalid. Then go to Step 1-b).

Step 3) Data transmission:
   After a stable coalition structure (i.e., sub-band and power allocation) is obtained, each UU starts data transmission with the optimal power calculated from (13). Note that the duration of data transmission should be less than the channel coherence time.

In each iteration, each of the ULSs will negotiate with $K-1$ other ULSs in a single sub-band. Considering there are K ULSs and M sub-bands, we can see that the time complexity is $\mathcal{O}((K-1)KM)$.

we consider the communication overhead of the proposed protocol at the worst case. If we assume the size of the control packets in the proposed protocol is v bits, then the overhead for channel gain estimation and neighborhood discovering is at most $[K + 2(K-1)]v$ bits. For the negotiation part, in each iteration there are at most $[(k-1)KM]v$ bits are sent. Recall that the coalition structure is proved to be 2^n-finite, hence searching the core requires at most $2^K - 1$ iterations. Therefore, in the worst case, the communication overhead will be $[(2^K - 1)(k-1)KM + 3K - 2]v$ bits.

B. Distributed Algorithm

To reduce the number of iterations, we can use the similar way to that in [8] to drive the feasible region of the sub-band price μ_j, which is given by $\mu_j \in [0, \overline{\mu}]$. Let $\overline{v}$ be the upper bound of v_{S_k} and $\underline{h}$ be the lower bound of $|h_{jk}|^2$, then we have $\overline{\mu} = \frac{\overline{v}}{\underline{h}}$.

Algorithms I and II are proposed to find the SE of the hierarchical game. For any given $\overline{Q}$, $\overline{p}$ pair and the channel gains, the algorithms achieve the SE which contains a stable overlapping coalition structure and an optimized power allocation for each UU. We have the following proposition about the SE of the game.

Algorithm 1 OCF Algorithm for Sub-band Allocation

Step - 1)*Sensing:*

a) The UUs, after receiving the prices of available sub-bands from the MCO, sequentially send a short training message to estimate their pay-off in all the sub-bands when the sub-bands are exclusively used by S_k.

b) Each S_k broadcasts the sub-band combination $\boldsymbol{l}^*_{S_k}$ that maximizes its pay-off sum,

$$\boldsymbol{l}^*_{S_k} = [l^{(1)}_{S_k}, l^{(2)}_{S_k}, ..., l^{(n)}_{S_k}]. \quad (25)$$

Let $\mathcal{R}^* = \{\boldsymbol{l}^*_{S_k} : S_k \in \{1, ..., K\}\}$.

Step - 2) *Negotiation:*

a) All the active UUs need to negotiate with each other on each of the sub-bands in $\mathcal{R}^*$ to obtain the possible pay-off division factor $\lambda^m_{S_k}$.

b) After the negotiation process, S_k solves problem (1) based on the new set of $\lambda^m_{S_k}$, and obtains a new sub-band allocation to maximize its pay-off. Then S_k updates and broadcasts its optimal sub-bands allocation. Step 2) is repeated until no UU wants to change its occupied sub-bands.

Algorithm 2 Distributed Interference Control Algorithm

Definitions: At iteration t, let

- $\mu^m(t)$ be the pricing coefficient of sub-band m,

Step - 1) *Initialization:*

- Set $\mu^m \geq \overline{\mu}, \forall m \in \{1, 2, ..., M\}$.
- Set $\epsilon > 0$ to be a small positive constant.

Step - 2) *Price Adjustment:*

a) At iteration t, MCO updates and broadcasts $\boldsymbol{\mu}(t) = (1 - \epsilon)\boldsymbol{\mu}(t-1)$.

b) Each S_k senses the sub-bands and negotiates with other active UUs in the same sub-bands to determine the sub-band allocation $\boldsymbol{l}^{m*}(t)$ and power allocation $\boldsymbol{p}^{m*}(t)$.

c) All active UUs repeat Step 2-b) to update their optimal sub-bands, and the outcome is a coalition structure $\boldsymbol{P}^m(t)$.

d) The MCO monitors the aggregated interference in each sub-band. If $N_j > \overline{Q}$, the price adjustment in sub-band j stops. If $N_j \leq \overline{Q}$, go to Step 2a).

Step - 3) *Termination:*

The algorithm ends with solution $\boldsymbol{\mu}^* = \boldsymbol{\mu}(t-1), \boldsymbol{P}^* = \boldsymbol{P}(t-1)$ in which the element $p^{m*}_{S_k}(\mu^{m*})$ is given by (13).

Proposition 3. *The price μ^m always converges to a non-negative value if a non-negative power allocation for a given $\overline{p}$ and $\overline{Q}$ pair exists.*

Proof 3. *: See Appendix C.* □

From propositions 2 and 3, we conclude that, for any given $\bar{p}$ and $\overline{Q}$, the proposed algorithms will converge to the SE of the hierarchical game. The simulation results provided in section IV support this claim.

Remark 2. *The hierarchical game works as follows. At the beginning of iteration, the MCO broadcasts the price $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ to all UUs in its coverage area. Each UU decides its optimal transmit power and sub-band based on the received pricing information sent by MCO. Once all UUs have made the decisions, MCO will adjust the price based on the interference before going to the next iteration.*



Fig. 4. A time frame of proposed algorithm.

The proposed algorithms can be implemented in a distributed manner. On the MCO side, it does not need to inquire any information from the UUs, e.g., the interfering link gain $h^m_{S_k}$ or corresponding transmit power $p^m_{S_k}$. It just measures the aggregated interference at its receiver in each channel, and adjusts the price accordingly. On the UUs side, with the channel price and the link gain information measured with in a coalition, they can easily derive the potential pay-off gained by joining different coalitions. Therefore each of them can choose the best profited coalition combination to take part in.

Considering the time overhead, for information exchange between the MCO and the UUs, there is a need for only one dedicated channel for the MCO to broadcast the interferences prices. The implementation is illustrated in Fig. 4. A time frame for data transmission can be divided into two phases: the power control phase and the data transmission phase. In the power control phase, the time is divided into several time slots, which corresponds to an iteration in the proposed interference control algorithm. In each time slot, the MCO first measures the interference it is suffering, then adjusts the interference prices in each sub-band. Upon receiving the interference prices, the UUs re-allocate their power in each sub-band based on the prices and the measured mutual interference. After several iterations when the prices and power allocation are stable, each of the ULSs uses its power allocation in the last time slot to perform data transmission. Suppose the price and power allocation will converge after L time slots, each time slot duration is τ, and the data transmission time is t, then the time overhead of the proposed algorithm should be $\frac{t}{K\tau+t}$.

VII. Numerical Results

In this section we investigate the performance of the proposed hierarchical game framework in the spectrum-sharing based femto-cell network. To better illustrate how to apply proposed algorithm adapts to various network environments, we consider the network system under different sets of interference and power constraints, as well as different numbers of



Fig. 5. Convergence performance. $\overline{p} = 50$, $\overline{Q} = 2$. The curves illustrates the convergence of the interference prices in an 8 sub-bands network.



Fig. 6. Convergence performance of the price under different $\overline{Q}$, $\overline{p} = 100$. The curves shows the impact of $\overline{Q}$ on the convergence speed.

UUs K and available sub-bands M combinations. The result shows that the proposed algorithm can automatically fit the constraints no matter which one dominates or both of them jointly apply.

Fig. 5 illustrates the convergence of interference in a network with 8 sub-bands, with $\overline{p} = 50$ and $\overline{Q} = 2$. In Fig. 5, the trend of the curves shows that the prices converge at around hundreds of iterations. Furthermore, it is noted that the prices in each sub-band converge at the similar speeds. This is because the prices of MCO directly control sub-band allocation and the power allocation of UUs. Finally, the price charged to different sub-bands are independent with each other, which coincides with the definition in (18).

In Fig. 6, the convergence rate of average prices under different $\overline{Q}$ value is provided. An interesting observation is that, under the same power cap constraint, the convergence speed in the case of large $\overline{Q}$ is generally much faster than that in the case of small $\overline{Q}$. This phenomenon can be explained as follows: with the increase of $\overline{Q}$, each UU will allocate more power in each sub-band, hence under a fixed power cap constraint, each UU can access less sub-bands. Under tour setting, accessing less sub-bands is equivalent to join less coalitions. Hence, a large $\overline{Q}$ reduces the chances for UUs to join many coalition, which result in a reduced complexity for coalition formation, and thus the time cost on forming a stable coalition structure can be significantly reduced.

Figs. 7 to 8 show the convergence rate of the sub-band prices as well as the pay-offs of the MCO and UUs network. The tested network contains 64 UUs and 128 sub-bands, with $\overline{p} = 100$. Fig.7 compares the pay-offs of the MCO versus the interference and power constraints. Assuming the channel coefficients are fixed, we increase one constraint while fixing the other one. It is observed that at the beginning of each time slot, the pay-offs increase with the constraint before they become steady. The reason for this is that initially the interference constraint is much tighter, which becomes the main limitation of the transmit power. However, when the



Fig. 7. The impacts of varying the interference constraint: the pay-off sum increases with $\overline{Q}$.

interference constraint becomes larger, the transmit power is then jointly limited by both interference and power cap constraints. Finally when the interference constraint becomes very loose, the transmit power is limited by the power cap constraint so the system performance becomes stable.

Fig. 8 illustrates the choice of interference limit $\overline{Q}$ against the average price $\overline{\mu}$ over all sub-bands. The average price $\overline{\mu}$ generally reflects the how much interference LUs can tolerate. It is observed that the price at $\overline{Q} = 10$ is higher than that at $\overline{Q} = 50$. This shows that the price decreases with the value of $\overline{Q}$. Generally speaking, the less the value of $\overline{Q}$, the rarer the resource is, so the price is accordingly larger. More specifically, it is obvious that the larger the $\overline{Q}$, the larger the possible transmit power of UU. If we look at the optimal power solution $p_{S_k}^{m*} = \left(\frac{1}{\mu^m h_{S_k}^m} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{S_k}^m}\right)^+$, we can see that $p_{S_k}^{m*}$ decreases with μ^m, hence in sub-band m, a larger transmit power $p_{S_k}^{m*}$ results in a smaller interference price μ^m.



Fig. 8. The impacts of interference constraint: the average price $\overline{\mu}$ decreases with $\overline{Q}$.



Fig. 10. Comparison of $\overline{Q} = 10$ and $\overline{Q} = 50$. The number of coalitions versus the number of sub-bands.



Fig. 9. Comparison of $\overline{Q} = 10$ and $\overline{Q} = 50$. The number of active UUs versus the number of sub-bands.



Fig. 11. Comparison of $\overline{Q} = 10$ and $\overline{Q} = 50$. The average number of coalitions one UUs join against the number of available sub-bands.

Figs. 9 to 12 investigate the impact of the number of available sub-bands on the payoffs of UUs. Fig. 9 and 10 shows the number of active UUs and the number of coalitions, under different numbers of sub-bands respectively. It is seen that the number of active UUs is always lower than the total number of UUs. The reason is that if the channel gains of some UUs are highly correlated, the low payoff UUs will always be forced to leave the coalition. From Fig. 9, it is observed that in general the larger $\overline{Q}$ the more active UUs, because larger $\overline{Q}$ enables more chances for the UU to transmit. Fig. 10 shows that the more available sub-bands the more coalitions formed, because when overlapping is enabled, the number of coalitions will be limited by the number of available sub-bands.

Fig. 11 and 12 shows the average number of coalitions each UU joins and the average prices of sub-bands versus the number of sub-bands. Fig. 11 shows that the UU tends to join multiple coalitions when the number of available sub-bands increases, because in this case the players with lower pay-off in a crowded coalition may be better-off if joining a new coalition. Fig. 12 presents that the sub-band prices tend to decrease with the number of available sub-bands. When the UUs access multiple sub-bands, the aggregated interference in a single sub-band will be lower, which resulting lower sub-band prices. Another observation is that the price at $\overline{Q} = 10$ is higher than that at $\overline{Q} = 50$ because the tolerated interference is low when $\overline{Q}$ is small. Therefore the price is accordingly higher.

Figure 13 compares the proposed OCF algorithm with the traditional coalition formation setting without overlapping. It is illustrated directly in the figure that the improvement of data rate by enabling overlapping. When the power available for transmit goes high, the UUs in OCF scheme are benefited by exploring more chances to transmit on multiple sub-bands while in the CF schemes each of the UU can only access a single sub-band.



Fig. 12. Comparison of $\overline{Q} = 10$ and $\overline{Q} = 50$. The average interference prices versus number of sub-bands.



Fig. 13. The comparison between CF and OCF schemes.

VIII. Conclusion

The sub-band allocation and the power control issues in the carrier-aggregation-enabled HetNet are studied in this paper. We have developed a hierarchical game framework to jointly solve the power and sub-band allocation problems under the constraints of the transmit power and maximum tolerable interference level. We established a Stackelberg game for MCO to regulate the transmit power of the UUs so as to give sufficient protection to the LUs while optimizing the pay-off of the UUs. We also apply OCF-game to analyze the behavior of the UUs that can self-organize into overlapping coalitions. We have proposed a simple two-layer algorithm to let the UUs iteratively search for the optimal coalition structure and the power allocations under different prices imposed by the macro-cell. It has been proved that the proposed algorithm can always converges to the SE of hierarchical game and at the same time the resulting transmit power and the sub-band allocations are stable and no players can further improve their payoff by unilaterally deviate from it by acting alone. Furthermore, by allowing the overlapping in the coalition formation among UUs,, we have addressed the problem of sub-band and power allocation problem under two dimension constraints. The proposed framework can also be extended into more general network setting with multiple BSs to cooperatively share their sub-bands or the downlink communication that multiple LUs need to be protected.

Appendix A
Proof of Proposition 1

Suppose a partial coalition $\boldsymbol{p}^{m*} = \{p_{S_k}^{m*} : k = 1, 2, ...K\}$ is formed on sub-band m, in which the positive power $p_{S_k}^{m*}$ is given by (13), i.e.,

$$\boldsymbol{p}^{m*} = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{p}^m} \pi(\boldsymbol{p}^m). \tag{26}$$

We define the support of $\boldsymbol{p}^{m*}$ as,

$$\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{p}^{m*}) = \{S_k : p_{S_k}^{m*} > 0, k = 1, 2, ...K\}^m, \tag{27}$$

which defines a coalition of UUs regardless the resource distribution. Hence, for any other partial coalition $\boldsymbol{p}^{m'}$ with the support supp($\boldsymbol{p}^{m*}$), we have

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{p}^{m*}) \geq \pi(\boldsymbol{p}^{m'}), \tag{28}$$

i.e., the partial coalition $\boldsymbol{p}^{m*}$ *blocks* all other partial coalitions formed on sub-band m which involves with supp($\boldsymbol{p}^{m*}$).

Therefore, we can say that the partial coalition $\boldsymbol{p}^{m*}$ in our proposed game is one-to-one correspondent to the coalition $\{S_k : p_{S_k}^{m*} > 0, k = 1, 2, ...K\}^m$ formed on sub-band m. Since $\{S_k\}^m \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, i.e., $\{S_k\}^m$ is a subset of $\mathcal{K}$, the number of all possible partial coalitions equals to the number of subset of $\mathcal{K}$, which is given by,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{K} \binom{K}{n} = 2^K - 1. \tag{29}$$

This concludes the proof. □

Appendix B
Proof of Proposition 2

1) Continuous. The value function in (22) is the difference between a log function and a linear function, which is obviously continuous.
2) Monotone. The interference power constraint in (1) limits the total transmit power allocated in sub-band m indirectly by pricing in the Stackelberg game. Hence the power allocated by S_k in sub-band m is bounded by $p_{S_k}^{m*}$. Since the pay-off function, $\pi(p_{S_k}^m)$, of S_k is concave, then for any $\pi(p_{S_k}^{m'}) \in [0, p_{S_k}^{m*}]$ we have $\pi(p_{S_k}^{m'}) \leq \pi(p_{S_k}^{m*})$. Therefore for any $\boldsymbol{p}^{m'}$ and $\boldsymbol{p}^{m*}$, such that $p_{S_k}^{m'} \leq p_{S_k}^{m*}$, we have $\boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{p}^{m'}) \leq \boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{p}^{m*})$, i.e., the value function is monotone.
3) Bounded. According to the proof in 2), the value function is bounded by $\boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{p}^{m*})$, where $\boldsymbol{p}^{m*} = (p_{S_1}^m, p_{S_2}^m, ..., p_{S_K}^m)$ satisfies $\sum_{k=1}^{K} h_{S_k}^m p_{S_k}^m = \overline{Q}$.
4) U-finite. The proof can be referred to proposition 1.

5) The inequality. The equality of (24) is always taken in the proposed game since the value function is the summation of individual pay-off of the member players.

□

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3

In previous section we proved that finding optimal pricing using $\mu^{m*} = \arg\max_{\mu^m} \pi_{MCO}(\boldsymbol{p}^*, \mu^m)$ is equivalent to solving $\sum_{k=1}^{K} \left(\frac{1}{\mu^{m*} h_{S_k}^m} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{S_k}^m} \right)^+ h_{S_k}^m = \overline{Q}$. Hence the pay-off maximizing for MCO can be achieved by choosing the optimal price to control the interference approaching $\overline{Q}$. In other words, the only two cases that the MCO will stop further increasing or decreasing prices are, 1) $\sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{S_k}^m h_{S_k}^m \leq \overline{Q}$, and 2) $\mu^m = 0$. In other words, the price μ^m can always converge to a fixed price. □

REFERENCES

[1] X. Kang, R. Zhang, and M. Motani, "Price-based resource allocation for spectrum-sharing femtocell networks: A stackelberg game approach," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 538–549, 2012.

[2] V. Chandrasekhar, J. G. Andrews, T. Muharemovic, Z. Shen, and A. Gatherer, "Power control in two-tier femtocell networks," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 8, no. 8, pp. 4316–4328, 2009.

[3] T. Alpcan, T. Başar, R. Srikant, and E. Altman, "Cdma uplink power control as a noncooperative game," *Wireless Networks*, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 659–670, 2002.

[4] G. Yuan, X. Zhang, W. Wang, and Y. Yang, "Carrier aggregation for lte-advanced mobile communication systems," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 88–93, 2010.

[5] Y. Xiao, C. Yuen, P. Di Francesco, and L. A. DaSilva, "Dynamic spectrum scheduling for carrier aggregation: A game theoretic approach," in *IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*. Budapest, Hungary, 2013.

[6] Y. Xiao, T. Forde, I. Macaluso, L. A. DaSilva, and L. Doyle, "Spatial spectrum sharing-based carrier aggregation for heterogeneous networks," in *IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*. Anaheim, USA, 2012.

[7] Y. Xiao, G. Bi, and D. Niyato, "Distributed optimization for cognitive radio networks using stackelberg game," in *IEEE International Conference on Communication Systems (ICCS)*. Singapore, 2010.

[8] Y. Xiao, G. Bi, D. Niyato, and L. A. DaSilva, "A hierarchical game theoretic framework for cognitive radio networks," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 30, no. 10, pp. 2053–2069, 2012.

[9] S. Haykin, "Cognitive radio: brain-empowered wireless communications," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 201–220, 2005.

[10] A. Ghosh, R. Ratasuk, B. Mondal, N. Mangalvedhe, and T. Thomas, "Lte-advanced: next-generation wireless broadband technology [invited paper]," *IEEE Wireless Communications Magazine*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 10–22, 2010.

[11] P. Yuan, Y.-C. Liang, and G. Bi, "Price-based distributed resource allocation for femtocell networks," in *IEEE International Conference on Communication Systems (ICCS)*. Singapore, 2012.

[12] T. Yang, L. Zhang, and L. Yang, "Cognitive-based distributed interference management for home-enb systems with single or multiple antennas," in *IEEE 21st International Symposium on Personal Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications (PIMRC)*. Istanbul, Turkey, 2010.

[13] A. Attar, V. Krishnamurthy, and O. N. Gharehshiran, "Interference management using cognitive base-stations for umts lte," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 49, no. 8, pp. 152–159, 2011.

[14] Z. Han and H. V. Poor, "Coalition games with cooperative transmission: a cure for the curse of boundary nodes in selfish packet-forwarding wireless networks," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 203–213, 2009.

[15] R. J. La and V. Anantharam, "A game-theoretic look at the gaussian multiaccess channel," *DIMACS series in discrete mathematics and theoretical computer science*, vol. 66, pp. 87–106, 2004.

[16] Y. Xiao, K.-C. Chen, C. Yuen, Z. Han, and L. DaSilva, "A bayesian overlapping coalition formation game for device-to-device spectrum sharing in cellular networks," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 14, no. 7, pp. 4034–4051, 2015.

[17] Z. Zhang, L. Song, Z. Han, and W. Saad, "Coalitional games with overlapping coalitions for interference management in small cell networks," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 2014.

[18] Q. Zhao and B. M. Sadler, "A survey of dynamic spectrum access," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 79–89, 2007.

[19] S. Mathur, L. Sankar, and N. B. Mandayam, "Coalitions in cooperative wireless networks," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 1104–1115, 2008.

[20] E. Telatar, "Capacity of multi-antenna gaussian channels," *European Transactions on Telecommunications*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 585–595, 1999.

[21] Y. Xiao, G. Bi, and D. Niyato, "A simple distributed power control algorithm for cognitive radio networks," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 10, no. 11, pp. 3594–3600, 2011.

[22] M. Razaviyayn, Z.-Q. Luo, P. Tseng, and J.-S. Pang, "A stackelberg game approach to distributed spectrum management," *Mathematical programming*, vol. 129, no. 2, pp. 197–224, 2011.

[23] T. Basar, G. J. Olsder, G. Clsder, T. Basar, T. Baser, and G. J. Olsder, *Dynamic noncooperative game theory*. SIAM, 1995, vol. 200.

[24] R. B. Myerson, *Game theory*. Harvard university press, 2013.

[25] F. P. Kelly, A. K. Maulloo, and D. K. Tan, "Rate control for communication networks: shadow prices, proportional fairness and stability," *Journal of the Operational Research society*, pp. 237–252, 1998.

[26] G. Chalkiadakis, E. Elkind, E. Markakis, and N. R. Jennings, "Overlapping coalition formation," in *Internet and Network Economics*. Springer, 2008, pp. 307–321.

[27] J. Zhao, H. Zheng, and G.-H. Yang, "Distributed coordination in dynamic spectrum allocation networks," in *IEEE International Symposium on New Frontiers in Dynamic Spectrum Access Networks (DySPAN)*. Baltimore, Maryland, USA, 2005.

[28] K. C.-J. Lin, S. Gollakota, and D. Katabi, "Random access heterogeneous mimo networks," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 146–157, 2011.